REMARKS

The Office Action dated March 6, 2008 has been received and considered. In this response, claims 8 and 35 have been amended for clarity purposes and to correct a punctuation informality. The amendments to the claims do not narrow the scope of the claims and support for the amendments may be found in the specification and drawings as originally filed. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in the present application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

Allowability of Claims 2, 4, 5, 8-10, 14-18, 20, 24, 25, 28-31, and 33-42

The Applicants note with appreciation the indication at page 3 of the Office Action that claims 17, 18, 20, 24, 25, 28-31, and 33-42 are allowable and that that claims 2, 4, 5, 8-10, and 14-16 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. However, the Applicants have opted to forgo rewriting the claims as suggested by the Office in view of the following remarks.

Anticipation Rejection of Claims 1, 3, and 13

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1, 3, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kobayashi (U.S. Patent No. 4,394,690). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Kobayashi teaches a technique that "relates to television receivers capable of varying the aspect ratio of the reproduced image." *Kobayashi*, col. 1, lines 6 and 7. To achieve this, Kobayashi teaches that "an identification (ID) signal S_I at a particular frequency may be superimposed on the sync chip" and "the deflection circuit thereof may be automatically switched with detection of the ID signal," whereby "a corresponding aspect ratio of the image reproduction on the cathode-ray tube 3 (for instance 1:2) is obtained" from the ID signal. *Id.,* col. 1, lines 20-26 and col. 1, lines 54-65. One of ordinary skill in the art will therefore appreciate that Kobayashi teaches the particular location of the display of an image on a monitor is based on the aspect ratio of the image. To this end, Kobayashi demonstrates a decomposition of various CRT screens (i.e., Fig. 1b and Fig. 1c) into various regions, which is done for the purpose of demonstrating how an image of a specific aspect ratio is displayed on a CRT with a possibly different aspect ratio. *See Id.*, col. 1, lines 42-51 and col.1, line 66-col. 2, line 4. As an

example Kobayashi teaches that for "an elongated image, for instance, is reproduced in the areas A, B_1, B_2 is reproduced as shown in FIG 1B, and its projection is focused on the screen 10 over the entire areas A', B_1', B_2', as shown in FIG 1C" so that "the areas C_1 and C_2 of the cathode-ray tube 3 are not used." *Id.*

Independent claim 1 recites the features "receiving, at a device driver, a first display information for a video image, the first display information indicating ***a portion*** of the video image to be displayed in ***a window*** of a first monitor." At page 3 of the Office Action, the Office asserts that "Kobayashi discloses a receiving step (1), and a determining step (7) [of Fig. 1a]" and "as shown in Figure 1B, the ID signal S_I determines the position of the image being displayed on the CRT screen 3" and thus teaches this feature of claim 1. However, one of ordinary skill in the art will appreciate that the areas of Kobayashi (i.e., A, A', B_1, B_2, B_1', B_2', C_1, and C_2) used for displaying images of different aspect ratios are merely areas of the display and are not the same as, or equivalent to a window as recited by claim 1 and as taught by the present application and understood by those of ordinary skill in the graphic interface arts. To wit, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Kobayashi that the areas A, A', B_1, B_2, B_1', B_2', C_1, and C_2 can be manipulated in some manner separate from the remainder of the display area, in contrast to a window as understood in the art. As Kobayashi fails to disclose a window of a monitor in which a portion of a video image is to be displayed, Kobayashi necessarily fails to disclose, or even suggest, the features "receiving, at a device driver, a first display information for a video image, the first display information indicating a portion of the video image ***to be displayed in a window*** of a first monitor" as recited by claim 1.

Independent claim 1 further recites the features "determining a first aspect ratio of the video image based on the first display information at the device driver." Assuming Kobayashi teaches obtaining the aspect ratio of an image, Kobayashi teaches that it is the aspect ratio of the ***entire*** image and at no point does Kobayashi disclose, or even suggest, determining the aspect ratio of ***a portion*** of an image to be displayed in a window (i.e., the first display information). One of ordinary skill in the art will appreciate that the aspect ratio of the entire image to be displayed on a CRT is not the same as, or equivalent to, a portion of an image associated with a window. For example, a portion of an image associated with a window may vary dynamically in size from one image frame to the next, whereas an entire image to displayed on a CRT has a

fixed size. Kobayashi therefore fails to disclose or suggest the above-identified features recited by claim 1.

As discussed above, Kobayashi fails to disclose, or even suggest, at least one feature of independent claim 1 and thus Kobayashi fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature recited by claim 1 as well as the particular combinations of features recited by claims 3 and 13 at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from claim 1. Moreover, these dependent claims recite additional novel features not disclosed or suggested by the cited reference.

Claim 13 recites the features "the window is one of a ***plurality of application windows*** of the first monitor to be simultaneously displayed." The Office cites Kobayashi as teaching these features by asserting that cathode-ray tube 3 of Kobayashi "is intended to show a plurality of application windows." *Office Action*, p. 3. However, as discussed above, Kobayashi teaches that the reproduction of an image in an area of a CRT, but such area is not the same as, or equivalent to a window, much less that it is one of a plurality of application windows of a monitor that are simultaneously displayed. One of ordinary skill in the art will appreciate the different areas of a monitor in which an image can be selectively displayed, as taught by Kobayashi, are not same as, or equivalent to, a plurality of application windows to be simultaneously displayed as is provided by claim 13. Kobayashi therefore fails to disclose or suggest the features "the window is one of a plurality of application windows of the first monitor to be simultaneously displayed" as recited by claim 13.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of claims 1, 3, and 13 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

The Applicants believe no additional fees are due, but if the Commissioner believes additional fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-3797.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ryan S. Davidson/
Ryan S. Davidson, Reg. No. 51,596
LARSON NEWMAN ABEL POLANSKY & WHITE, LLP
5914 W. Courtyard Dr., Suite 200
Austin, Texas 78730
(512) 439-7100 (phone) (512) 439-7199 (fax)

May 27, 2008
Date